

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT |) | |
| NEGOTIATED BY GTE SOUTH |) | |
| INCORPORATED AND ONECOMM |) | |
| CORPORATION, N.A., NEXTEL |) | CASE NO. 97-269 |
| COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO |) | |
| SECTIONS 251 AND 252 OF THE |) | |
| TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996 |) | |

O R D E R

On June 11, 1997, GTE South Incorporated ("GTE") and OneComm Corporation, N.A., NEXTEL Communications ("NEXTEL") submitted to the Commission their negotiated agreement for interconnection. The agreement was negotiated pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act"), 47 U.S.C. Sections 251 and 252. Section 252(e) of the 1996 Act requires the parties to an interconnection agreement adopted by negotiation to submit the agreement for approval to the Commission.

The Commission has reviewed the agreement and finds that no portion of the agreement discriminates against a telecommunications carrier not a party to the agreement. The Commission also finds that the implementation of this agreement is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

NEXTEL must comply with all relevant Commission mandates for serving in this Commonwealth including the submission of documents verifying the establishment of an

escrow account or the posting of a bond to cover six percent of NEXTEL's gross receipts from the provision of intrastate service for Universal Service Fund obligations.¹

The Commission, having been otherwise sufficiently advised, HEREBY ORDERS that:


1. The negotiated agreement between GTE and NEXTEL is approved.
2. Within 20 days of the date of this Order, NEXTEL shall file documents demonstrating that an escrow account or bond has been established to pay its Universal Service Fund obligations.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 16th day of July, 1997.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


Chairman


Vice Chairman


Commissioner

ATTEST:


Executive Director

¹ See Administrative Case No. 355, An Inquiry Into Local Competition, Universal Service, and the Non-Traffic Sensitive Access Rate, Order dated September 26, 1996 at 51 and 54.